

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, and 15 remain pending in the present patent application.

Claims 8 and 15 are amended herein. Claims 2, 5, 6, 10-14, and 16-20 were previously canceled herein without prejudice. No new matter has been added herein as a result of the amendments.

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 8 has been amended to clarify “said second line segment” and “said third line segment” as addressed in the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection and reflects the following:

A method for entering blueprint data into a handheld device comprising:
entering a start point for a first line segment;
entering a length for said first line segment;
entering a direction for said first line segment;
entering a start point for an arc;
entering an end point for said arc;
entering a radius for said arc;
entering and displaying said line segment and said arc on a display associated with said handheld device;
providing a segment editor to automatically parse said arc into a plurality of arc subdivisions;
entering a start point for a second line segment, wherein said start point of said second line segment is an end point of said first line segment;
entering and displaying said second line segment on said display;
entering a start point for a third line segment, wherein said start point of said third line segment is an end point of said ~~first~~ second line segment;
translating said second line segment so that the start point of said second line segment coincides with an end point of said third line segment;
~~entering a start point for a third line segment, wherein said start point of said third line segment is an end point of said second line segment;~~
entering and displaying said third line segment on said display; and

storing said first, second, and third line segments as a hierarchical sequence, and wherein editing, or deletion of said second line segment automatically identically translates said third line segment without translating said first line segment.

Support for the amendment, “identically” can be found at least in Applicant’s specification on page 12, lines 11-16. A similar amendment is made to Applicant’s Claim 1 and Claim 15.

Claim 15 has been amended to reflect the following:

A computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions stored therein for performing a method of processing a plurality of line segments received one at a time and stored in a hierarchical sequence:
receiving line segment data entry fields, arc data fields comprising a start point field, an end point field, and a radius field;
displaying input line segments and arc data;
accepting one at a time a storing and an editing of said input line segments and said arc data, said editing of said arc data further comprising an arc segmenter for automatically segmenting a previously placed arc into at least two distinct arc segments; and
in response to editing, insertion, or deletion of a selected line segment of a plurality of line segments received one at a time and stored in a hierarchical sequence according to said being received one at a time, identically translating line segments succeeding said selected line segment without translating line segments preceding said selected line segment.

Support for the amendments reflected above can be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 12, lines 11-16 and 18-22, and page 13, lines 8-12.

35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, the instant Office Action

states, “Therefore, it is not clear as to which ‘third line segment’ is being referred to by the recited ‘said third line segment’, which renders the claim as indefinite” (instant Office Action, page 3, section 7). Furthermore, “Dependent claim 9 is rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of base claim 8” (instant Office Action, page 3, section 7).

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8 is amended herein to account for a clear rendering of the “third line segment” and is thus in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 9 depending on Claim 8 is patentable as being dependent on an allowable base Claim.

35 U.S.C. §102(a) Rejections

Claim 15

The Office Action mailed November 12, 2008 (hereinafter, “instant Office Action”) rejected Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Microsoft Word 2003 (hereinafter, “MS Word”) running on a general computer system. The rejection and comments set forth in the instant Office Action have been carefully considered by the Applicant. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 15 is not anticipated by MS Word in view of at least the instant response.

Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 15 recites:

A computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions stored therein for performing a method of processing a plurality of line segments received one at a time and stored in a hierarchical sequence:
receiving line segment data entry fields, arc data fields comprising a start point field, an end point field, and a radius field;
displaying input line segments and arc data;

accepting one at a time a storing and an editing of said input line segments and said arc data, said editing of said arc data further comprising an arc segmenter for automatically segmenting a previously placed arc into at least two distinct arc segments; and

in response to editing, insertion, or deletion of a selected line segment of a plurality of line segments received one at a time and stored in a hierarchical sequence according to said being received one at a time, identically translating line segments succeeding said selected line segment without translating line segments preceding said selected line segment.

Claim 1 includes features similar to Claim 15.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”. MPEP §2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 103 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). “The elements must be arranged as required by the claim...” *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant respectfully submits that MS Word remains silent as to:

receiving line segment data entry fields, arc data fields comprising a start point field, an end point field, and a radius field;
displaying input line segments and arc data;

accepting one at a time a storing and an editing of said input line segments and said arc data, said editing of said arc data further comprising an arc segmenter for automatically segmenting a previously placed arc into at least two distinct arc segment; and

in response to editing, insertion, or deletion of a selected line segment of a plurality of line segments received one at a time and stored in a hierarchical

sequence according to said being received one at a time, identically translating line segments succeeding said selected line segment without translating line segments preceding said selected line segment.

(emphasis added) as is recited in Applicant's Claim 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that MS Word does not teach each and every element, either expressly or inherently, in Applicant's Claim 15. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that MS Word does not anticipate the features as are set forth in independent Claim 15, and as such, Claim 15 traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and is condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 15

The instant Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over User Guide PocketCAD PRO Version 4.0 (hereinafter, "PocketCAD") running on a general mobile device, May 2001 of record in view of Christensen, et al. (hereinafter, "Christensen"). The rejection and comments set forth in the instant Office Action have been carefully considered by the Applicant. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 15 are patentable over PocketCAD in view of Christensen in view of at least the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of PocketCAD and Christensen does not satisfy the requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness

because the features of Claims 1, 8, and 15 would not have been obvious over the combination of PocketCAD and Christensen as a whole.

“As reiterated by the Supreme Court in *KSR*, the framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries” including “[a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art” (MPEP 2141(II)). “In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious” (emphasis in original; MPEP 2141.02(I)).

Moreover, Applicant respectfully notes that “[t]he prior art reference (or references when combined) need not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. However, Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art” (emphasis added; MPEP 2141[III]).

Applicant respectfully reiterates that the features of Applicant’s claimed invention as a whole would not have been obvious, and therefore the instant Office Action does not satisfy the requirements for a rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant Office Action fails to explain why these differences would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant respectfully agrees with the instant Office Action that:

PocketPAD [sic] fails to expressly teach wherein editing, insertion, or deletion of a selected line segment, translates line segments that succeed the selected line segment of said hierarchical sequence without translating line segments that precede the selected line segment in said hierarchical sequence.

(instant Office Action, page 5, last paragraph) as is recited in Applicant's Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of PocketCAD and Christensen as a whole fails to suggest the features of Applicant's Claim 1 because there is no motivation or suggestion within Christensen to modify PocketCAD to arrive at the features of Applicant's Claim 1.

Applicants understand Christensen to teach a technique in which "the user of an interactive computer graphics application which allows the user to attach lines to objects such that when the objects move, the lines will rubber-band to follow the object. (Christensen, Abstract). Moreover, Christensen provides that "the 'sticky' attribute can just as easily be applied to a line end which touches an object so as to cause the line end to follow the object should it be moved" (Christensen, column 6, line 3-6). Additionally, "the 'sticky' attribute... may also be applied to lines which touch or overlay other lines" (Christensen, column 6, lines 8-10).

Specifically, Christensen fails to suggest,

...in response to editing, insertion, or deletion of a selected line segment of a plurality of line segments received one at a time and stored in a hierarchical sequence according to said being received one at a time, identically translating line segments succeeding said selected line segment without translating line segments preceding said selected line segment.

(emphasis added) as is recited in Applicant's Claim 1. In fact, Christensen is not capable of "identically translating" line segments. Its sticky attribute pulls lines without identically translating the lines.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant Office Action does not explain why the differences between PocketCAD, Christensen, and Applicant's claimed features would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Thus, in view of the combination of PocketCAD and Christensen not satisfying the requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness, Applicant respectfully asserts Claim 1 is patentable for the rationale described herein. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8 and 15 are patentable for the reasons described herein regarding Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 3, 4, and 7 depending on Claim 1 are patentable as being dependent upon an allowable base Claim.

Claim 9

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over PocketCAD in view of Christensen, and in further view of Minakata (U.S. Patent Application No. 5,568,565). The rejection and comments set forth in the instant Office

Action have been carefully considered by the Applicant. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 9 is patentable over PocketCAD in view of Christensen, and in further view of Minakata in view of at least the following rationale.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of PocketCAD, Christensen, and Minakata does not satisfy the requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the features of Claim 9 would not have been obvious over the combination of PocketCAD, Christensen, and Minakata as a whole.

Applicant understand Minakata to disclose “[a] handwriting input method and apparatus [that] is disclosed which generates a single line segment from a group of input line segments which are input by a user” (Minakata, Abstract). However, nothing in Minakata suggests modifying PocketCAD or Christensen to arrive at the features of Applicant’s Claim 1, such as to “identically translate” (emphasis added) line segments.

Thus, in view of the combination of PocketCAD, Christensen, and Minakata not satisfying the requirements of a *prima facie* case of obviousness, Applicant respectfully asserts Claim 1 is patentable for the rationale described herein. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 9 depending on Claim 1 is patentable as being dependent upon an allowable base Claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and remarks presented herein, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, and 15 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Dated: 12/29, 2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner, Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Wagner Blecher LLP
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076
(408) 377-0500